

Minutes of ESD Safety Committee Meeting 25 January 2006

Attending: G.S. Bodvarsson, Tim Kneafsey, Todd Wood, Jil Geller, Rob Connelly, Tom Daley, Kryshna Aviña

Critical Items:

Feedback from Bo – Howard (EH&S Division Director) gave feedback about the audit. Most of the feedback was positive. There are three Divisions with good EH&S records. Physical Biosciences, ESD, and Life Sciences. The big issue was about not reporting accidents. We have to make sure that people understand that they will not be punished for reporting an accident. Jil suggested we change our motto - We strive for excellence in ES&H practices, and when accidents happen, we learn from them. It is difficult to report an accident in a climate like this. We have to think about not only our own personal consequences, but to also think about the consequences for the Division and the Lab as a whole. In addition, we have to start thinking of ways to “reward” people for recognizing and reporting all accidents. People must understand that they will not lose their job if they report an accident. However, in this climate, you cannot have both – telling people that there is the potential for a Lab-wide shutdown if there is an accident, and in the same breath telling them that they should report all accidents. There should be an emphasis on the principles of ISM – think about what you are going to do before you do it.

EH&S is moving away from advertising statistics as a way of reducing accidents, but statistics are still driving DOE pressure to reduce accident rates.. Statistics are there for people who want to see them, but EH&S’ focuses is now on proactive safety. There was an email from the DOE Site Office to Ray Orbach reporting on the Peer Review that was circulated at the meeting.

Action: Bo will ask Howard for the presentation and forward it to the Safety Committee for their review. Safety committee will develop proposals to promote accident reporting.

Other Items:

1. Minutes Tabled - PENDING REVIEW.

2. **Discussion of typical findings from PI walkthroughs and ESD semi-annual walkthrough (e.g.) chemical storage/segregation)** Getting the checklist helped people identify what the Division wanted to promote. There were cases where people checked something off as OK and during the walkthrough there were findings. People sometimes were unclear on certain aspects of the procedures.
3. **Implementation of requirements for safety glasses in all labs, splash goggles or face-shield when handling chemicals**—Hazen wrote a letter to EH&S about implementing the use of safety glasses inside a Lab at all times. You could be using the safety glasses for a task and take them off for another task, and forget to put them back on. It is a matter of having the glasses on at all times when they are in a Lab. You can even obtain progressive lenses safety glasses here at the Lab through Health Services. In order to be in compliance, the glasses need to be rated according to the ANSI standard (should have Z87.1 stamped on the lens.) There needs to be a stock of good quality, good selection of safety glasses in all labs. Perhaps the Division should also pay to install holders for all of

the safety glasses for staff. As an example, when hearing protection is readily available, it is used. We determined that in Building 64, safety glasses should be required in the high bay, but not in the inside room. They are already required in the machine shop.

Action: Safety Committee Members (SCM) need to figure out how to communicate to their respective groups and to implement this new initiative.

4. **Inspection checklist**—It is nice to have a list of things of that an inspection might point out. This was a manageable way of looking at the highest-priority potential risks, and what to fix to prevent findings.
5. **Getting rid of old chemicals**—Joern Larson is available in helping to dispose of legacy chemicals. If you are not using a chemical, get rid of it. There is no cost to you. There is the potential for us to have to start paying for the disposal, so the sooner that we dispose of chemicals that we don't use, the better.
6. **Frequency of Safety Committee Meetings**—It seems that a monthly meeting is pretty optimal as far as the majority of the Safety Committee was concerned.
7. **Other**—Good discussion on the need to give more credit to Lab and Field staff that have to spend more of their project funds for safety, and also have to bear the greater risk of ES&H issues compared to other staff. We need to look for ways to provide more support to lab and field staff; Division funds for taping floor clearances, or for Joern to requisition legacy chemicals as hazardous waste are two good examples. The shortage of field support staff and lab support staff within the Division is a problem – there is a shortage of personnel, and puts more and more of the “support tasks” on the PI. Similarly to using overhead costs on computer support staff, safety support could be obtained. With the big push towards a zero incidence here on the Hill, it would be wise for the Division to find ways to increase support of PIs for safety-related activities.